

a force sensing transducer mounted in a hollow in said frame; and

a deflectable component mounted in the hollow in said frame in motion transmitting relationship to said transducer;

said deflectable component having first and second integral segments mounted at an angle relative to each other.

REMARKS

Claims 21-42 are now in the application. For the reasons discussed below, favorable consideration of those claims is believed to be in order.

With respect to Section 3, page 2 of the Action claims 21, 26, and 39 replace original claims 1, 6, and 19. The objected to expressions "ringlike" and "hingelike" do not appear in the new claims.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the formal rejections is believed to be inapplicable to the claims now in the application.

Now pending claims 21-42 are also believed to be clearly patentable over the Hendl et al. Reference applied in the outstanding Office Action.

Specifically, claims 21-38 are limited to a force transducer having a sensing element which is preloaded in compression along a force sensing axis of the transducer as is required in patent claim 21. There is nothing in Hendl which suggests that the sensing element of his sensor 2 be preloaded at all, let alone preloaded in compression along a force sensing axis of a sensing element as is required in claim 21. Consequently, claim 21 is considered clearly patentable over Hendl et al. Claims 22-38 depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 and are considered patentable over Hendl et al. For *inter alia*, the same reasons as the parent claim.

Newly presented claims 39 and 40 replace original claims 19 and 20 which were also rejected on the basis of the Hendl et al. reference. The newly presented claims are considered clearly patentable over Hendl et al. Nothing in that reference teaches, or in any other way makes obvious, a load transducer with a sensing element and a preloading element in surface-to-surface contact with the sensing element as is required in parent claim 39. *A fortiori*, the reference does not make obvious such an arrangement in which the surface of the preloading element is in contact with the sensing element over a distance substantially equal to the span of the sensing element 42.

Newly presented claims 41 and 42 are also considered clearly patentable over Hendl et al. Claim 41 is limited to a force transducer in which a force sensing element is located between two internal elements of a frame of a load carrying component. Nothing resembling this arrangement is made obvious by Hendl. Nor does Hendl et al. make obvious a force transducer with, as required in claim 42, a force responsive, deflectable, component having first and second, integral and angularly related segments.



RECEIVED

FEB - 3 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

The references made of record but not applied are not believed to be pertinent to the patentability of the claims now before the Examiner and have accordingly not been commented on above. However, applicant is fully prepared to do so upon request by the Examiner.

For the reasons discussed above, favorable reconsideration of the application is now believed to be in order and is accordingly solicited.

Applicant has above increased the total number of claims in the application by two and increased the total number of independent claims from two to four. A fee calculation sheet and a check for \$60 for extra claims fee are attached.

Signed at Shelton, Washington this 23rd day of January 2003.

Respectfully Submitted,

RICHARD A. HANSON

By: Richard D. Multer

Richard D. Multer

Registration No. 20,661

P.O. Box 2384

Shelton, Washington 98584

Phone 360-427-6031

Fax 360-427-4025

Email rmulter@inventorlaw.com